

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 19 and 20 have been amended as shown on pp. 2 and 4-5 of the Reply. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conversations on April 16, 2007, wherein the Examiner indicated that the amendments and comments made herein should place the subject application in better condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrari, *et al.* (US Publication Number 2003/0097357) in view of Bailey, *et al.* (US Patent 6,785,671). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Ferrari, *et al.* either alone or in combination with Bailey, *et al.* does not teach or suggest every feature of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

Applicants' subject matter relates to a system and method to facilitate automated and interactive quality controls that are automatically applied to a technical documentation. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly 19 and 20), as amended, recites ***bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items***. Furthermore, independent claim 27 recites a quality packet that automatically deploys

positive features of the quality actions that exceed a predetermined threshold *to other topics* and independent claim 28 recites a deployment field that indicates further actions derived from topics with scores above a predetermined threshold are *automatically applied to the database collection of topics*. Ferrari, *et al.* either alone or in combination with Bailey, *et al.* does not teach or suggest these novel aspects.

Ferrari, *et al.* relates to a system and method that employs rules to manipulate content presentation in a search and navigation system. Specifically, a search interface allows the user to enter queries that are employed to classify documents. The system manipulates content presentation based on information about a user's query and a current navigation state by employing rules specified by a rules engine and can include documents that may not be in the set of documents specified by the present navigation state or can provide options to navigate to a new navigation state based on a rule or plurality of rules activated by the query. Furthermore, the system can also filter or sort documents in the navigation state based on the rule or plurality of rules activated by the query. (See page 6 and 7, [0083]-[0084]). However, Ferrari, *et al.* is silent with respect to bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items. Ferrari, *et al.* does not disclose a system wherein problems in an item are identified and corrected such that corrective action is applied across other items in the documentation set to increase overall quality.

Applicants' subject specification, in contrast, discloses a system combines automated rules-based and interactive quality review methods to create and maintain quality measures across large documentation sets wherein quality is a measurable function of document accuracy, document scope, and document discoverability. In particular, the system enables interactive quality assessment of the items in a documentation set and allows for bulk remediation of common quality problems across groups of documents within the set. A rules engine interprets the items in view of one or more quality metrics and determines perceived problems with the item, facilitates remediation of the problems and /or replicates beneficial insights across the set. Along with correcting identified problems the system applies a broader analysis to increase the overall quality of the set. For example, it may be statistically determined that introductory subject matter is much more likely to be accessed and scrutinized by

respective users of the documentation. Thus, commentary received regarding introductory type topics or subject matter can be analyzed and applied in a uniform manner across other items in the set (*e.g.*, add introductory paragraph to pseudo code examples) that also may have topics associated with this type subject matter. In this manner, the overall quality of the documentation set can be improved. (*See* page 8, lines 11-20). Ferrari, *et al.* is silent with regard to application of corrective action, determined in an item, to disparate items across the documentation set.

Bailey, *et al.* relates to a system and method that facilitates viewing search results that span multiple item categories, and locates web pages that include offerings for products and other type of items. Bailey, *et al.* does not disclose quality assessment of items in a document set that includes indication of technical accuracy of the item and the ranking of items is not based on accuracy of items. Furthermore, Bailey, *et al.* does not teach or suggest a system or method that facilitates application of corrective action, determined in an item, to disparate items across the documentation set and thus fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies presented by Ferrari, *et al.* with respect to the subject claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that neither Ferrari, *et al.* nor Bailey, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, suggests each and every feature of independent claims 1, 19, 20 and 27-28 (and claims 2-18 and 21-26 that depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claims. Hence, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP492US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731